

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully submit that the listing of the claims above reflect an agreement reached between Applicant's representative and the Examiner during telephonic Examiner Interviews, initiated by the Examiner on August 9, and conducted between August 11-August 14, 2006, as further detailed below. A copy of the amendments to the claims with strike-throughs and underlining identifying each amendment (with minor correction noted below) has been included in the Notice of Allowability mailed on August 16, 2006, and thus the listing of claims shown in this response merely reflect those changes with the underlining and strike-throughs removed. However, Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner Amendment to independent claim 31 incorrectly omits the underlining of the phrase "access to data corresponding to data corresponding to the granted file lock," which also was added as part of the amendment to the claim during discussions with the Examiner. Applicants have submitted this response to correct the record as to this omission and to the substance of the Examiner Interview as described below. Applicants respectfully submit that currently pending claims 1-48 are in condition for allowance, and that the issue fee payment is forthcoming.

I. Interview Summary


The undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Ms. Diane Mizrahi for initiating and conducting telephone interviews from August 11-August 14th, 2006 with Applicants' representative, David Rodack (Registration number 47,034) to discuss the patentability of claims 1-48 in view of art reference *Miloushev* (U.S. Publication No. 20040133652), as well as to discuss amendments to independent claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 41 to address concerns as to potential 35 U.S.C 101 and 112 issues. That is, Applicants do not believe that the amendments

were made to overcome the prior art of record, as stated in the Interview Summary, but in contrast, to obviate potential rejections under 35 U.S.C 101 and 112. Applicants' representative asserted during the interviews that claims 1-48 are patentable over the *Miloushev* due at least in part to the absence of a "file lock indicator" in *Miloushev*, and Applicants still believe *Miloushev* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "file lock indicator." Thus, the Examiner and Applicant's representative agreed to the amendments to claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 41 to obviate potential rejections under 35 U.S.C 101 and 112. Those amendments are identified in the Examiner's Amendment (with the exception noted above as to the omission of the underlining of the phrase "access to data corresponding to data corresponding to the granted file lock"), and reflected in the listing of claims in this response.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request entry of this response to correct the record, and further submit that Applicants' pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



David Rodack
Registration No. 47,034

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500